

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
NASHIRI, et al.

Patent Application No.: 10/590,188

Date Filed: January 29, 2007

For: IMPREGNATION PROCESS

Examiner: Turocy, David P.
Art Group: 1717
Confirmation No.: 3520

INTERVIEW SUMMARY UNDER 37 CFR §1.133

Mail Stop AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Please make the following INTERVIEW SUMMARY of record according to 37 CFR §1.133(b),
MPEP §713.04.

PARTICIPANTS:

1. Examiner: David P. Turocy
2. Applicant's counsel: Joseph Chu. No. 64596; Vic Lin No. 43754

DATE OF INTERVIEW: January 11, 2012

TYPE OF INTERVIEW: Telephonic

EXHIBITS OR DEMONSTRATIONS: n/a

SPECIFICATION DISCUSSED: p. 5 – p. 8

CLAIMS DISCUSSED: Independent claims 1, 31, and 32.

PRIOR ART DISCUSSED: EP 068010 ("EP 810")

DRAWINGS DISCUSSED: n/a

PRINCIPAL PROPOSED AMENDMENTS AND ARGUMENTS DISCUSSED:

Applicant presented to the Examiner that the main point of novelty in the current application is the simultaneous one-step process of acetic anhydride impregnation and acetylation chemical reaction. Applicant respectfully pointed out to the Examiner that unlike the process claimed in the current application, the cited prior art, EP 068010 (“EP 810”), discloses a two-step process of first acetic anhydride impregnation into the wood, followed by acetylation reaction.

In particular, Applicant presented to the Examiner that EP 810 does not teach or suggest applying pressure during the preheating step of the working solution. The step of preheating the working solution under pressure to ensure the working solution remains in the liquid phase is not needed in EP 810, because EP 810 teaches a two-step process. The application of pressure and heat in EP 810 is only required during the first step of impregnation. In contrast, the process claimed in the current application requires preheating the working solution under pressure in order to achieve the claimed one-step process.

The Examiner noted that EP 810 discloses a two-step process. However, the Examiner also noted that EP 810 discloses a temperature and pressure claimed in the current application. Therefore, the Examiner suggested that EP 810 may have some form of a combined impregnation and acetylation reaction similar to the process claimed in the current application. In other words, the Examiner pointed out that without specifying other parameters such as the temperature range, it may be inherent that some of the impregnated acetic anhydride in the wood was undergoing the acetylation reaction process as well during the impregnation step, albeit incomplete.

RESULTS:

The Examiner provided Applicant with helpful suggestions on how to put the claims in a better condition for allowance, including focusing on amending the claims to reflect the temperature range of the acetylation reaction. Applicant appreciated the Examiner’s input and agreed to take into consideration the Examiner’s suggestions in the Office Action response.

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Turocy for granting the telephone interview. Applicant has received the Interview Summary mailed on January 13, 2012. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney if any open issues remain with respect to the telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

/Vic Lin/

Vic Lin, Esq.
Registration No. 43,754
Innovation Capital Law Group, LLP
19900 MacArthur Boulevard, Suite 1150
Irvine, CA 92612
Tel: (949) 954-5430
Fax: (949) 223-9610
Customer No. 97066
February 24, 2012